arXiv:hep-ph/0110057v1 4 Oct 2001

Relative phase between the three-gluon and one-photon amplitudes of the J/ψ decays *

N.N. Achasov
Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Sobolev Institute for Mathematics
Academician Koptiug prospekt, 4, 630090 Novosibirsk,Russia
()

Abstract

It is shown that the study of the $\omega - \rho^0$ interference pattern in the $J/\psi \to (\rho^0 + \omega)\eta \to \pi^+\pi^-\eta$ decay provides evidence for the large (nearly 90°) relative phase between the isovector one-photon and three-gluon decay amplitudes.

In the last few years it has been noted that the single-photon and three-gluon amplitudes in the two-body $J/\psi \to 1^-0^-$ and $J/\psi \to 0^-0^-$ [1–3] decays appear to have relative phases nearly 90°.

This unexpected result is very important to the observability of CP violating decays as well as to the nature of the $J/\psi \to 1^-0^-$ and $J/\psi \to 0^-0^-$ decays [1–6,?]. In particular, it points to a non-adequacy of their description built upon the perturbative QCD, the hypothesis of the factorization of short and long distances, and specified wave functions of final hadrons. Some peculiarities of electromagnetic form factors in the J/ψ mass region were discussed in Ref. [8].

The analysis [1–3] involved theoretical assumptions relying on the strong interaction $SU_f(3)$-symmetry, the strong interaction $SU_f(3)$-symmetry breaking and the $SU_f(3)$ transformation properties of the one-photon annihilation amplitudes. Besides, effects of the $\rho - \omega$ mixing in the $J/\psi \to 1^-0^-$ decays were not taken into account in Ref. [1] while in Ref. [2] the $\rho - \omega$ mixing was taken into account incorrectly , see the discussion in Ref. [9]. Because of this, the model independent determination of these phases are required.

Fortunately, it is possible to check the conclusion of Refs. [1,2] at least in one case [9,10]. We mean the relative phase between the amplitudes of the one-photon $J/\psi \to \rho^0\eta$ and three-gluon $J/\psi \to \omega\eta$ decays.

The point is that the $\rho^0 - \omega$ mixing amplitude is reasonably well studied [11–17]. Its module and phase are known. The module of the ratio of the amplitudes of the ρ and ω production can be obtained from the data on the branching ratios of the J/ψ-decays. So,

---

[*] Parallel session talk at HADRON 2001, Protvino, Russia, August 30

the investigation of the $\omega-\rho$ interference in the $J/\psi \to (\rho^0+\omega)\eta \to \rho^0\eta \to \pi^+\pi^-\eta$ decay provides a way of measuring the relative phase of the ρ^0 and ω production amplitudes.

Indeed, the $\omega-\rho$ interference pattern in the $J/\psi \to (\rho^0+\omega)\eta \to \rho^0\eta \to \pi^+\pi^-\eta$ decay is conditioned by the $\rho^0-\omega$ mixing and the ratio of the amplitudes of the ρ^0 and ω production:

$$\frac{dN}{dm} = N_\rho(m)\frac{2}{\pi}m\Gamma(\rho\to\pi\pi\,,\,m)\left|\frac{1}{D_\rho(m)}\left(1-\varepsilon(m)\left[\frac{N_\omega(m)}{N_\rho(m)}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}\exp\left\{i\left(\delta_\omega-\delta_\rho\right)\right\}\right)\right.$$
$$\left.+\ \frac{1}{D_\omega(m)}\left(\varepsilon(m)+g_{\omega\pi\pi}/g_{\rho\pi\pi}\right)\left[\frac{N_\omega(m)}{N_\rho(m)}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}\exp\left\{i\left(\delta_\omega-\delta_\rho\right)\right\}\right|^2 \tag{1}$$

with

$$\varepsilon(m) = -\frac{\Pi_{\omega\rho^0}(m)}{m_\omega^2-m_\rho^2+im\left(\Gamma_\rho(m)-\Gamma_\omega(m)\right)}, \tag{2}$$

where m is the invariant mass of the $\pi^+\pi^-$-state, $N_\rho(m)$ and $N_\omega(m)$ are the squares of the modules of the ρ and ω production amplitudes, δ_ρ and δ_ω are their phases, $\Pi_{\omega\rho^0}(m)$ is the amplitude of the $\rho-\omega$ transition, $D_V(m)=m_V^2-m^2-im\Gamma_V(m)$, $V=\rho,\,\omega$.

We obtained in Refs. [9,10]

$$\varepsilon(m_\omega)+g_{\omega\pi\pi}/g_{\rho\pi\pi} = (3.41\pm0.24)\cdot10^{-2}\exp\left\{i\,(102\pm1)^\circ\right\}\ . \tag{3}$$

The branching ratio of the $\omega\to\pi\pi$ decay

$$B\left(\omega\to\pi\pi\right) = \frac{\Gamma\left(\rho\to\pi\pi\,,\,m_\omega\right)}{\Gamma_\omega(m_\omega)}\cdot\left|\varepsilon(m_\omega)+g_{\omega\pi\pi}/g_{\rho\pi\pi}\right|^2. \tag{4}$$

The data [18,19] were fitted with the function

$$N(m) = L(m)+\left|(N_\rho)^{\frac{1}{2}}\,F_\rho^{BW}(m)+(N_\omega)^{\frac{1}{2}}\,F_\omega^{BW}(m)\exp\{i\phi\}\right|^2\ , \tag{5}$$

where $F_\rho^{BW}(m)$ and $F_\omega^{BW}(m)$ are the appropriate Breit-Wigner terms [18] and $L(m)$ is a polynomial background term.

The results are

$$\begin{aligned}&\phi=(46\pm15)^\circ\,,\quad N_\omega(m_\omega)/N_\rho=8.86\pm1.83\quad[18]\,,\\&\phi=-0.08\pm0.17=(-4.58\pm9.74)^\circ\,,\quad N_\omega(m_\omega)/N_\rho=7.37\pm1.72\quad[19]\,.\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

From Eqs. (1), (4), and (5) it follows

$$N_\rho = N_\rho(m_\rho)\left|1-\varepsilon(m_\rho)\left[N_\omega(m_\rho)/N_\rho(m_\rho)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}\exp\{i\left(\delta_\omega-\delta_\rho\right)\}\right|^2\ , \tag{7}$$

$$N_\omega = B(\omega\to\pi\pi)N_\omega(m_\omega)\,, \tag{8}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\phi=\delta_\omega-\delta_\rho+arg\left[\varepsilon(m_\omega)+g_{\omega\pi\pi}/g_{\rho\pi\pi}\right]-\\&-arg\left\{1-\varepsilon(m_\rho)\left[N_\omega(m_\rho)/N_\rho(m_\rho)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}\exp\{i\left(\delta_\omega-\delta_\rho\right)\}\right\}\simeq\\&\simeq\delta_\omega-\delta_\rho+arg\left[\varepsilon(m_\omega)+g_{\omega\pi\pi}/g_{\rho\pi\pi}\right]-\\&-arg\left\{1-\left|\varepsilon(m_\omega)\right|\left[N_\omega(m_\omega)/N_\rho\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}\exp\{i\phi\}\right\}\ .\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

From Eqs. (3), (6) and (9) we get that

$$\delta_\rho - \delta_\omega = (60 \pm 15)^\circ \quad [18]\,, \tag{10}$$
$$\delta_\rho - \delta_\omega = (106 \pm 10)^\circ \quad [19]\,. \tag{11}$$

Whereas δ_ρ is the phase of the isovector one-photon amplitude, δ_ω is the phase of the sum of the three-gluon amplitude and the isoscalar one-photon amplitude. But luckily for us the latter is a small correction. Really, it follows from the structure of the electromagnetic current

$$j_\mu(x) = \frac{2}{3}\bar{u}(x)\gamma_\mu u(x) - \frac{1}{3}\bar{d}(x)\gamma_\mu d(x) - \frac{1}{3}\bar{s}(x)\gamma_\mu s(x) + ... \tag{12}$$

and the Okubo-Zweig-Iizuka rule the ratio for the amplitudes under consideration (**please image all possible diagrams!**):

$$\frac{A\,(J/\psi \to \text{ the isoscalar photon} \to \omega\eta)}{A\,(J/\psi \to \text{ the isovector photon} \to \rho\eta) \equiv A\,(J/\psi \to \rho\eta)} = \frac{1}{3}\,. \tag{13}$$

Taking into account Eqs. (6) and (7) one gets

$$\frac{|A\,(J/\psi \to \text{ the isoscalar photon} \to \omega\eta)|}{|A\,(J/\psi \to \text{ the three-gluon} \to \omega\eta)|} \approx \frac{1}{9}\,. \tag{14}$$

From Eqs. (10), (11) and (14) one gets easily for the relative phase (δ) between the isovector one-photon and three gluon decay amplitudes

$$\delta = (60 \pm 15)^\circ\ - 4^\circ \qquad [18]\,, \tag{15}$$
$$\delta = (106 \pm 10)^\circ - 6^\circ \qquad [19]\,, \tag{16}$$

if the isoscalar and isoscalar one-photon decay amplitudes have the same phase. In case the isoscalar one-photon and three-gluon (isoscalar also!) decay amplitudes have the same phase

$$\delta = (60 \pm 15)^\circ \qquad [18]\,, \tag{17}$$
$$\delta = (106 \pm 10)^\circ \qquad [19]\,. \tag{18}$$

So, both the MARK III Collaboration [18] and the DM2 Collaboration [19], see Eqs. (15), (17) and (16), (18), provide support for the large (nearly 90°) relative phase between the isovector one-photon and three-gluon decay amplitudes.

The DM2 Collaboration used statistics only half as high as the MARK III Collaboration, but, in contrast to the MARK III Collaboration, which fitted N_ω as a free parameter, the DM2 Collaboration calculated it from the branching ratio of $J/\psi \to \omega\eta$ using Eq. (8).

In summary I should emphasize that it is urgent to study this fundamental problem once again with KEDR in Novosibirsk and with BES in Beijing.

But I am afraid that only the τ-CHARM factory could solve this problem in the exhaustive way.

I gratefully acknowledge discussions with San Fu Tuan.

The present work was supported in part by the grant INTAS-RFBR IR-97-232.

REFERENCES

[1] G. Lopez Castro, J.L. Lucio M. and J. Pestieau, AIP Conf. Proc. **342**, 441 (1995), hep-ph/9902300.

[2] M. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. **D 57**, 5717 (1998).

[3] M. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. **D 60**, 051501 (1999).

[4] J.L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. **D 60**, 074029 (1999).

[5] Y.F. Gu and S.F. Tuan, Nucl. Phys. **A 675**, 404c (2000).

[6] J.-M. Gerard and J. Weyers, Phys.Lett. **B 462**, 324 (1999).

[7] S.F. Tuan, Plenary session, these Proceedings.

[8] N.N. Achasov and A.A. Kozhevnikov, Phys. Rev. **D 58**, 097502 (1998); Yad. Fiz. **62**, 364 (1999).

[9] N.N. Achasov and V.V. Gubin, Pis'ma v ZhETF **72**, 3 (2000) [JETP Lett. **72**, 1 (2000)].

[10] N.N. Achasov and V.V. Gubin, Phys. Rev. **D 61**, 117504 (2000).

[11] A.S. Goldhaber, G.S. Fox and C. Quigg, Phys. Lett. **30 B**, 249 (1969).

[12] M. Gourdin, L. Stodolsky and F.M. Renard, Phys. Lett. **30 B**, 347 (1969).

[13] F.M. Renard, Nucl. Phys. **B 15**, 118 (1970).

[14] N.N. Achasov and G.N. Shestakov, Nucl. Phys. **B 45**, 93 (1972);
Fiz. Elem. Chastits. At. Yadra **9**, 48 (1978) [Sov. J. Part. Nucl. **9**, 19 (1978)].

[15] N.N. Achasov and A.A. Kozhevnikov, Yad. Fiz. **55**, 809 (1992);
Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A 7**, 4825 (1992).

[16] N.N. Achasov, A.A. Kozhevnikov and G.N. Shestakov, Phys. Lett. **50 B** (1974) 448.
N.N. Achasov, N.M. Budnev, A.A. Kozhevnikov and G.N. Shestakov, Yad. Fiz. **23**(1976) 610.

[17] Particle Data Group, C. Caso et al., Eur. Phys. J. **C 3**, 1 (1998).

[18] D. Coffman *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D 38**, 2695 (1988).

[19] J. Jousset *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D 41**, 1389 (1990).